REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Office Action dated July 26, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1-32 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claim 5 was objected to because of an informality.

Claims 4, 21-22, and 31-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Christof Dallermassl: Aspects of Integration of Heterogeneous Server Systems in Intranets – the Java Approach (Dallermassl).

Summary of Response

Claims 2, 3, 6-19, 21, 23-26, 28-30, and 32 remain as originally submitted.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 20, 22, 27, and 31 have been amended.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Summary of Claims Pending

Claims 1-32 are currently pending following this response.

Drawings

Replacement drawing sheets were required. Formal drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) were submitted on September 26, 2006.

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because the use of the trademark JAVA should be capitalized wherever it appears. By the above amendments, Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Office Action and respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 was objected to because the word "goup" in the phrase "a goup of service objects" seemed to be a typographical error of "group". By the above amendments, Applicants have corrected Claim 5 to read "a group of service objects". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Response to Rejections under Section 112

Claims 4, 21-22, and 31-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4, 21-22, and 31-32 were rejected because they contain the trademark/trade names JAVA and Common Object Request Broker Architecture.

> However, if the product to which the trademark refers is set forth in such language that its identity is clear, the examiners are authorized to permit the use of the trademark if it is distinguished from common descriptive nouns by capitalization. If the trademark has a fixed and definite meaning, it constitutes sufficient identification unless some physical or chemical characteristic of the article or material is involved in the invention. In that event, as also in those cases where the trademark has no fixed and definite meaning, identification by scientific or other explanatory language is necessary. In re Gebauer-Fuelnegg, 121 F.2d 505, 50 USPQ 125 (CCPA 1941).
>
> MPEP - Section 608.01(v) "Trademarks and Names Used in Trade [R-2] - 600 Parts, Form, and Content of Application".

Applicants respectfully submit that the identity of the products referred to by the terms JAVA and Common Object Request Broker Architecture is clear. Applicants also respectfully submit that no physical or chemical characteristic of the article or material is involved in the invention. By the above amendments to the claims, the products are distinguished from common descriptive nouns by capitalization. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Response to Rejections under Section 101

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Office Action suggested that the services and method of Claims 1-32 do not produce tangible, concrete, and useful results. Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 20, and 27 to recite the tangible, concrete, and useful result of providing service location transparency such that the location of a service can be changed without effecting the behavior of an application. The support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Paragraph [0057] of

the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Response to Rejections under Section 102

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Christof Dallersmassl: Aspects of Integration of Heterogeneous Server Systems in Intranets – the Java Approach, Graz University of Technology, Graz, November 1999 ("Dallermassl").

Applicants respectfully submit that Dallermassl does not establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation as to Claim 1. Specifically, Claim 1 recites, "a second module operable to provide the location of the interface to an application in response to receiving a request from the application for the location of the service."

The Office Action appears to suggest that the JNDI, the Dino, or the Voyager ORB of Dallermassl teaches providing a location of an interface to an application requesting such information.

With regard to the JNDI, page 6 of the Office Action noted that the JNDI, "defines and supports hierarchical structures of objects using naming and directory services and having objects stored in directory." Applicants respectfully submit that using a naming or directory service to define and support hierarchical structures does not teach or suggest providing the location of an interface to an application requesting such information.

Dallermassl provides protocol-independent access by inserting a middleware layer between the client and the server. Therefore, the applications in the system taught by Dallermassl do not need to know the location of the service that they are trying access. They

simply submit their requests to the middleware system. Accordingly, the applications of Dallermassl do not request location information and, therefore, do not receive any.

In contrast, the present invention is directed to cases in which client applications access the services supported by service providers by invoking methods or function calls of application programming interfaces (APIs) provided by the service providers. In order to invoke these methods or function calls, the client application may need to know the location or address of the service provider. The enterprise naming service of the present invention provides a mechanism for client applications to look up the location or address of the service provider at the time the client application wishes to access the service supported by the service provider. This allows the location of the service provider to change without effecting the behavior of the client application. Dallermassl does not address the problems associated with changing the location of a service provider and, therefore, does not teach or suggest the solutions of the present invention.

With regard to Dino, the Office Action noted that, "a Dino, Distributed Interactive Network Objects, is implemented as an external embedded system enabled to connect all directory services." Applicants respectfully submit that connecting all directory services does not teach or suggest providing the location of an interface to an application requesting such information.

With regard to the Voyager ORB, the Office Action noted that, "Voyager ORB offers API allowing objects to communicate with CORBA naming service." Applicants respectfully submit that offering an API does not teach or suggest providing the location of an interface to an application requesting such information. Again, the applications of Dallermassl do not request location information and, therefore, do not receive any.

Because Dallermassl does not teach or suggest a second module operable to provide the location of the interface to an application in response to receiving a request from the application for the location of the service, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Dallermassl and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dallermassl does not establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation as to independent Claim 20. Specifically, Claim 20 has been amended to recite, "a look-up module operable to provide the location of the interface of the first service to a first application in response to a request by the first application for the first service, the look-up module further operable to provide the location of the interface of the second service in response to a request by a second application for the second service."

Again, the Office Action appears to suggest that the JNDI and the Dino of Dallermassl teach providing a location of an interface to an application requesting such information. However, as established earlier, the applications of Dallermassl do not request location information and, therefore, do not receive any. Dallermassl does not address the problems associated with changing the location of a service provider and, therefore, does not teach or suggest the solutions of the present invention.

Because Dallermassl does not teach or suggest providing a location of an interface to an application requesting such information, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 20 is not anticipated by Dallermassl and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dallermassl does not establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation as to independent Claim 27. Specifically, Claim 27 recites, "requesting, by an

application desiring to employ the service, the location of the service; and returning the location of the interface to the application."

Again, the Office Action appears to suggest that the JNDI and the Dino of Dallermassl teach providing a location of an interface to an application requesting such information. However, as established earlier, the applications of Dallermassl do not request location information and, therefore, do not receive any. Dallermassl does not address the problems associated with changing the location of a service provider and, therefore, does not teach or suggest the solutions of the present invention.

Because Dallermassl does not teach or suggest returning a location of an interface to an application requesting such information, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not anticipated by Dallermassl and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

Dependent Claims 2-19, 21-26, and 28-32 depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent Claims 1, 20, and 27 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for the reasons established above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1-32 are not anticipated by Dallermassl and respectfully request allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 23, 2006

Michael W. Piper
Reg. No. 39,800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)